



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,499	06/24/2003	Scott D'Avanzo	5611.00007	3208
29747	7590	06/21/2005	EXAMINER	
QUIRK & TRATOS 3773 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY SUITE 500 NORTH LAS VEGAS, NV 89109			MOSSER, ROBERT E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/603,499	Applicant(s) D'AVANZO, SCOTT	
	Examiner Robert Mosser	Art Unit 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-12-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION



Claims 1-32 are pending.

This action is non-final.



Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS filed February 12th, 2004 has been considered and is attached.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims **1 -32**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seelig et al (US 6,338,678) in view of Travis et al (US 5,380,007).

Art Unit: 3714

Regarding claims **1-2, 7-8, 17, 21, and 23**, Seelig teaches a electronic gaming machine comprising:

a primary game with multiple gaming indicia (Col 3:64-4:7);

a bonus game associated in communication with a primary game, displaying a container containing multiple indicators having a value of symbol depicted thereon, said multiple indicators being circulated until one or more indicators is selected(Col 5:54-6:5 & 2:8-2:10); and

wherein said values or symbols depicted on the selected indicators defines a bonus game reward(Col 6:19-26 7 & Figure 11).

Seelig is silent regarding the use of a video embodiment of the secondary selection game however Travis et al teaches such an embodiment for a ball selection game (Col 1:54-2:2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have utilized the video display of Travis in the invention of Seelig in order to avoid sound issues associated with an air compressor as well as to allow the use of one set of virtual indicators in place of two sets of actual indicators thereby reducing the manufacturing costing.

The invention of Seelig/Travis however is silent regarding the embodiments of the mixing container and balls as a blender and ice cubes respectively, however as no stated problem has been solved nor unexpected result obtained through the claimed embodiments these alterations are held to be a matter of design choice. IT would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have embodied

Art Unit: 3714

the indicators and vessel as ice cubes and a blender in order to encompass a desired game theme.

Regarding at least claims **3, 9, and 24**, Seelig teaches the inclusion of speakers (Col 7:56-60).

Regarding at least claims **4, and 10**, Seelig teaches the values or symbols depicted on the one or more simulated indicators are bonus awards or multipliers (Col 6:24-26).

Regarding at least claims **5, 18, and 30**, Seelig teaches the automatic activation of a secondary or bonus game in response to one or more pre-established outcomes (Col 5:11-13 & Col 5:58-6:3).

Regarding at least claims **6, 16, 20, and 32** Seelig teaches the association of a jackpot with the secondary game comprising indicators escaping in a predetermined order (Col 10:35-40).

Regarding at least claims **11, and 22**, Seelig teaches the circulation of award indicators with an air supply in communication with the device (Col 5:54-57).

Regarding at least claims **12, 25, and 26**, Seelig teaches the isolation of award indicators in ball holders which is equated to the claimed blender lid in view of the modification presented in the rejection of at least claim 2 above (Col 8:32-40).

Regarding at least claims **13, and 27**, Seelig teaches the use of gravity feeds (Col 8:32-40), but is silent regarding the use of vacuum tubes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized vacuum tubes in place of the

Art Unit: 3714

gravity feeds of Seelig/Travis in order to allow for Indicator arrangements in opposition to gravity.

Regarding at least claims **14**, **15**, **28**, and **29**, Seelig teaches a "lever" system for isolating award indicators (Element 66), controlled by the gaming machine (Element 76).

Regarding at least claims **19** and **31**, Seelig teaches player means to activate the indicator agitation (Col 5:46-59).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Mosser whose telephone number is (571)-272-4451. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris H. Banks can be reached on (571)272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

REM



JESSICA HARRISON
PRIMARY EXAMINER